

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,582	07/18/2003	Brian Edward Le Gette	GRAY006/01US	2123
22903	7590 10/27/2004		EXAMINER	
COOLEY GODWARD LLP ATTN: PATENT GROUP 11951 FREEDOM DRIVE, SUITE 1700 ONE FREEDOM SQUARE- RESTON TOWN CENTER			LEV, BRUCE ALLEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3634	
RESTON, VA 20190-5061			DATE MAILED: 10/27/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			_
4	Application No.	Applicant(s)	λ
	10/621,582	LE GETTE ET AL.	8
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bruce A. Lev	3634	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a plus within the statutory minimum of third will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON the, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communicati BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ion.
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ Th Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal mat	• •	is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 24-29 and 31-38 is/are pending in the day of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest signal is and signal is are rejected. 5) Claim(s) 24-29 and 31-38 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and signal is are subject.	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☑ The specification is objected to by the Examir 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the B	ccepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeya ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A ority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No I received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	<u>)</u>

Art Unit: 3634

1

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed September 23, 2004 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "a second frame". Which is not discussed in the Specification or shown in the drawings.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 24-29 and 31-38 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over the claims of U. S. Patent No.'s 6,478,038 and 6,595,227 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

Application/Control Number: 10/621,582

Art Unit: 3634

1

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: An apparatus comprising a frame; a membrane; a collapsible frame; straps; a covering; a pillow; and tension and extension members.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claims 24-38 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over the claims of copending Application No. 2003/0222484. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: An apparatus comprising a frame; a membrane; a collapsible frame; straps; a covering; a pillow; and tension and extension members.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Art Unit: 3634

ï

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 25, 26, 29, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kellogg et al 5,992,045.

Kellogg et al set forth an apparatus (best illustrated in Figures 4 and 5) comprising a membrane 30; a flexible, twistable frame member 20, a tension member and an extension member (inclusive of members 50 and 60); coupling members; and the method of using.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang 5,632,318.

Wang sets forth an apparatus comprising a frame; a membrane; a collapsible frame member 20; straps (inclusive of members 26 and 30); and a covering 32.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kellogg in view of Wang.

Kellogg sets forth the apparatus, as advanced above, except for the covering coupled to the frame and used for covering the membrane. However Wang teaches the use of a covering (inclusive of members 32) used for covering a membrane.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Kellogg by incorporating a covering, as

Art Unit: 3634

taught by Wang, in order to provide a convenient means to cover and store the apparatus.

Claims 27, 28, 31, 32-36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kellogg in view of the European Patent of Paroussiadis 202,862.

Kellogg sets forth the apparatus, as advanced above, except for the pillow coupled thereto. However *Paroussiadis teaches* the use of a pillow coupled to an apparatus including a frame and membrane. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Kellogg by incorporating a pillow, as taught by Paroussiadis, in order to provide head supporting means to a user.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's remarks filed September 23, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

As concerns remarks pertaining to the reference of *Kellogg*, the examiner takes the position that the web is stretched over the frame. If it was not, then the mesh would be flimsy and folds would form. Further, the examiner reiterates the position that the tension member and the extension member can be viewed as inclusive of members 50 and 60 which could be, and is, used to maintain the orientation of the apparatus.

As concerns remarks pertaining to the reference of *Wang*, the examiner takes the position that the frame member can be viewed as curved since. For one, the frame is in a circular configuration, and two, that when lying on a windshield of a car, it is in a

Application/Control Number: 10/621,582 Page 6

Art Unit: 3634

(slightly) curved configuration since the windshield (of most vehicles) is also in a slightly curved shape.

As concerns remarks pertaining to the a "second frame", the examiner reiterates the position that a "second" frame is not specifically discussed in the Specification nor shown in the drawings. Therefore, this is considered "new matter" and thus becomes a moot point.

Conclusion

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Page 7

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce A. Lev whose telephone number is (703) 308-7470.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.

10/19/2004

Bruce A. Lev Primary Examiner

Group 3600